



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/600,297

06/20/2003

Stephen D. Richardson

M61.12-0478

6312

27366

7590

07/27/2006

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

SUITE 1400

900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/600,297	Applicant(s) RICHARDSON ET AL.	
	Examiner John Chavis	Art Unit 2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/626,925. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because as an example, the invention of claim 1 of '925 consists of providing information to reduce the likelihood of an error in a program by receiving a correction input; while claim 1 of the present application consists of providing information to reduce the likelihood of an error in a program by processing an attempted translation and both are directed toward improving translation accuracy and therefore are considered related inventions.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Amendment

3. The preliminary amendment submitted on 6/20/03 is not clear and therefore, it has not been entered. The applicant does not specify that the amendment is to be inserted into the file or if it is merely provided as a description of the information already present. That is, if the data is to be entered it should be specifically indicated with specific instructions as to where it should appear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Santhanam et al. (6,247,174).

claims:

1. A computer implemented method for providing information to an automatic machine translation system to improve translation accuracy, the method comprising:

receiving a collection of source text;

receiving from the automatic machine translation system an attempted translation that corresponds to the collection of source text;

Santhanam

See the abstract and title.

“ “ “ “

See col. 1 lines 30-42 and col. 2 line 21-36.

processing the attempted translation and the collection of source text to identify an error in the attempted translation; and

providing information to the automatic machine translation system to reduce the likelihood that the error will be repeated in subsequent translations generated by the automatic machine translation system.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising: correcting the error; and providing a corrected translation.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein said receiving from the automatic machine translation system comprises receiving from a client upon which the automatic machine translation system is implemented.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein receiving from a client comprises receiving by way of a computer network.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein receiving by way of a computer network comprises receiving by way of the Internet.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein said receiving from the automatic machine translation system comprises receiving from a server upon which the automatic machine translation system is implemented.

7. The method of claim 6, wherein said receiving from a server

See col. 5 lines 14-19.

See col. 14 lines 3-16 and note that consistency checking and flagging helps to reduce repeated errors. Also, see col. 15 Lines 8-16.

“ “ “ “

See col. 6 lines 18-45, which specifies a front end processing (analogous to having a client or network providing information). However, where information is Received from does not change the overall functionality of the claimed invention.

“ “ “ “

“ “ “ “

“ “ “ “

“ “ “ “

comprises receiving by way of a computer network.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein providing information comprises providing information to be assimilated into the automatic machine translation system.

See the rejection of claim 1.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into a knowledge source associated with the automatic machine translation system.

" " " "

10. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into translation correspondence associated with the automatic machine translation system.

" " " "

Note also that the flagged portions that is inherently update information provides for this feature.

11. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into a collection of linguistic structures associated with the automatic translation system.

" " " "

12. The method of claim 11, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into a database of corresponding logical forms associated with the automatic

" " " "

machine translation system.

13. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into a collection of statistical parameters associated with the automatic machine translation system.

See the validation function in step (d)-ii of claim 47.

14. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into a collection of parsing information associated with the automatic machine translation system, the parsing information being information that enables a parser to provide analysis of a collection of segments.

See fig. 5, specifically item 506, 507 and 509.

15. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing update information to be assimilated into a collection of corresponding word associations associated with the automatic machine translation system.

“ “ “ “

16. The method of claim 8, wherein providing information to be assimilated comprises providing bilingual corpora.

See the intermediate representations in col. 6 lines 18-46.

In reference to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

The features of claim 18 are taught via claim 13.

See the rejections of claims 4 and 6 in view of claims 19-20.

As per claim 21, see claim 9.

In reference to claims 22-27, see the rejection of claims 11-14.

The features of claim 28 are taught via claim 16.

See the rejection of claims 1-16 in view of claims 29-39.

Other references, although not specifically cited is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. For example, reference 6,698,011 also discusses isolating errors in translating programs.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00am-4:30pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2193

JC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Chavis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

John Chavis
Primary Examiner AU-2193